

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:

WILLIAMS, JR. ET AL.

Group Art Unit: 2416

Application No. 10/706,704

Examiner: JUNG, Min

Confirmation No. 8581

Filing Date: November 12, 2003

For: Using Ordered Locking Mechanisms  
to Maintain Sequences of Items such  
as Packets

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants' representative Kirk Williams and Examiner Jung briefly discussed the application on April 13, 2006, as stated hereinafter. Applicants' representative pointed out to Examiner Jung the resubmitted IDS (which was originally properly filed on May 7, 2006) and its location in the image file wrapper of this case. Examiner Jung agreed to consider the cited one reference and to provide an indication of such consideration on the record. Additionally, Applicants' representative asked about the current preferred wording for method claims to conform to the USPTO's requirements in response to the decision in *In re Bilski*. Examiner Jung stated that an addition to the preamble of the claim probably would not be sufficient, and suggested that a clause after the preamble but before the steps stating that the following recited steps were performed by another statutory class should be sufficient.

Applicants greatly appreciate Examiner Jung's consideration and suggestion for moving the prosecution of this case forward towards issuance.

In re WILLIAMS, JR. ET AL., Application No. 10/706,704  
Interview Summary

Applicants believe that this paper fulfills the requirements of 37 CFR 1.133 and MPEP § 713.04. No exhibit was shown, no demonstration was conducted, and no prior art was discussed.

Respectfully submitted,  
**The Law Office of Kirk D. Williams**

Date: April 13, 2009

By



Kirk D. Williams, Reg. No. 42,229  
One of the Attorneys for Applicant  
CUSTOMER NUMBER 26327  
The Law Office of Kirk D. Williams  
PO Box 39425, Denver, CO 80239-0425  
303-282-0151 (telephone), 303-778-0748 (fax)